

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/868,322	MATSUEDA, YOJIRO
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jennifer T Nguyen	2674

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Dr. Takashi Miyazawa. (3) Jennifer Nguyen.

(2) Mr. Richard Kim. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 01 July 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 27, and 37.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ikeda et al., Motegi et al., and Rao

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

DR. Miyazawa and MR. Kim explained the differences between the prior art (Ikeda et al.) and the claims invention (amended), upon filing the official amendment, update search and further consider will be given.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required